

The Honorable Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks

Page 5

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 12-14 have been cancelled without prejudice in response to the official action dated June 20, 2001. Claims 7-9 have been canceled without prejudice in response to the official action dated November 29, 2001. The present application contains claims 10, 11 and 15-20.

Applicant has amended claim 10 to recite that a predefined output definition is received through a communications network. Applicant has amended claim 10 to clarify that the output definition is parsed to identify one or more texture expressions; at least one of the texture expressions includes a mathematical expression defining a texture; each texture expression is evaluated in terms of one or more texture expression evaluation parameters defined in the output definition to obtain a texture output; at least one of the texture expressions produces an audio texture, the texture expression evaluation parameters include a time-based parameter including an elapsed time from a user interface event. The amendment to claim 1 is fully supported by the application as originally filed, for example, page 13, line 2-3. No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendment.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Barrus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,397), referred to as Barrus, and Kamen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,141), referred to as Kamen. The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Barrus, Kamen and Elliot et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,241), referred to as Elliot. The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Barrus and Elliot.

The present application contains independent claims 10 and 16. Claims 11 and 15 depend on claim 10. Claims 17-20 depend on claim 16. Claims 1-9 and 12-14 have been cancelled.

The present invention is related to a network system for rendering a defined output from a transferred output definition. The output definition is transferred through a communications network, and is parsed to identify texture expressions. Texture

The Honorable Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks

Page 6

information is relatively large and thus makes heavy use of network bandwidth (on page 1, lines 20-23). According to the present invention, the texture expression is transferred as the output definition, which requires less bandwidth and/or storage space than those of the texture information.

Barrus discloses a system having a database for creating, modifying and transferring a virtual environment. The purpose of Barrus is to provide a system having a function that can handle multiple authors on multiple platforms. For this purpose, the Barrus uses the database for managing virtual environment information. The database can contain an audio file (on col. 13, lines 55-57). Figure 20 of Barrus discloses the process of exchanging information between a browser and a server. In response to a request from the browser, the server extracts information out of the database (col. 19, lines 27-31) and delivers the final image data to the browser using HTTP or other protocol (on col. 20, lines 45-46). Barrus neither discloses nor suggests the concept of the present invention as described above.

Kamen discloses a mathematical function defining a texture (on col. 2, lines 40-54). However, Kamen does not add anything to Barrus to render claim 10 unpatentable.

Elliot discloses the Reactive Behavior Modeling Language (RBML) for defining a model integrated media or interactive animation. Col. 8, lines 28-30 of Elliot discloses that the RBML model can define how the media content behaves over time. However, the RBML is a special language. There is not motivation to combine Barrus and Elliot. As described above, the server of Barrus provides full images to the browser. Thus, even if combining these references, the combination neither reaches the subject matter of the present invention.

Further, any one of cited references neither disclose nor suggests a texture expression parameter including an oscillation function as recited in claim 16.

Hence it is respectfully submitted that claims 10-11 and claims 15-20 are patentable in view of the cited references.

The Honorable Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks

Page 7

In view of the above amendments and remarks, and having dealt with all of the matters raised by the Examiner, early reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted.



Dallas F. Smith
Registration No. 34,074

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP
160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1P 1C3
Direct Dial: (613) 783-8827